

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/698,851	<b>Applicant(s)</b> VARANASI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> FARAH FAROUL	<b>Art Unit</b> 2416	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) FARAH FAROUL.

(2) Mr. Roberto de Leon.

**Date of Interview:** 2 September 2009

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

  
  

Claims discussed:

  
  

Prior art documents discussed:

*Wyatt (US 6,765,866 B1)*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  

/FARAH FAROUL/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2416

**Status of Application:** Allowed

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** 3:30 PM

  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In response to the appeal brief filed on May 19, 2009, the examiner contacted applicant's representative, Mr. Leon, to discuss newly discovered prior art reference Wyatt. The examiner contends that Wyatt teaches selecting an exit port of a switch out of multiple possible ports to maintain the order of the flow of frames. Applicant's representative argues that Wyatt does the above across a single trunk group. Although several trunk groups are shown in Fig 1B of Wyatt but each is associated with a different destination. Applicant's representative argues that the claimed invention distributes traffic across several trunk groups of a single destination. The examiner finds that applicant's arguments filed in the appeal brief and against the Wyatt reference to be persuasive. The previous rejection is withdrawn.